CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL" (37 CFR 1.10)			Doo	ket No.	
Applicant(s): Thomas	J. Lenosky		15436.253.81.2		
Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Customer No.	Group Art Unit	
10/789,622	February 27, 2004	Tesfaldet Bocure	022913	2631	
		REDUCING INTERFERENCE IN A	DATA STREAM	USING	
AUTOCO	RRELATION DERIVED	EQUALIZATION	OIPA		
	•			5	
			JAN 1 9 2005	37.	
I hereby certify that	the following corresponde	nce:	Panguagy.		
Issue Fee Transmitta	al Letter (1 pg., in duplicate	e); PTOL-85B Issue Fee Transmittal (1 pg., in duplicate	; Comments	
on Statement of Reas	sons for Allowance (1 pg.);	PTO-2038 Credit Card Form in the a			
postcard; and Certif		abel No. EV 524 682 846 US dentify type of correspondence)			
in haine demonited to			to Addresses	antico undos 27	
		stal Service "Express Mail Post Office			
CFR 1.10 in an enve	elope addressed to: Com	missioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450	, Alexanuria, VA	22313-1450 011	
	January 19, 2005 (Date)				
	(Duie)				
			ERIC L. MASCHOFF (Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)		
		Etdan			
		(Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)			
		EV 524 682 846 US			
		("Express Mail" Mailing Label Number)			
Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing.					



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

n re application of:)	
	Thomas J. Lenosky)	
Serial No:	10/789,622)) Art Unit	
Filed:	February 27, 2004) 2631)	
For:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REDUCING INTERFERENCE IN A DATA STREAM USING AUTOCORRELATION DERIVED EQUALIZATION)	
Examiner:	Tesfaldet Bocure)	

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the communication mailed on October 19, 2004. Applicant concurs with the Examiner's conclusion that the prior art does not suggest or render obvious the claimed invention. However, Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims in the above-identified application allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that distinguish the claim from the prior art and make it allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 19, 2005

Bv:

ERIC L. MASCHOFF

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 36,596 Customer No. 022913

ELM:mrl

W:\15436\253.81.2\ML0000001329V001.DOC